

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_103517</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of combined application of herbicides on growth, yield attributes, yield and profitability of Kharif groundnut [Arachis hypogaea (L.)]</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>If the manuscript is re-made according the suggestions it will be important for scientific community. In this form it is not.</b></p> <p><b>The title is suitable</b></p> <p><b>Abstract is full of notorious things. The concrete references connected with the topic of the manuscript missed. Look the comment for the Abstract in manuscript.</b></p> <p><b>I suggest to include one additional, very important part in Results and discussion about floristic compound of weed vegetation in the trial.</b></p> <p><b>After improving it will be completely scientifically correct.</b></p> <p><b>References are correct.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript technically is made very well, but presentation of results is very superficial. I suggest to authors to follow the tables and to present concrete numbers (values) in the text. Cliché forms like smallest in weedy check-highest in weed free control is not acceptable. Also, the place of notorious things is not in article which work up specific topic. All other remarks and suggestions are included in the manuscript, and I insist to act as it is mentioned.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zvonko Pacanoski</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>North Macedonia</b>